

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GUADALUPE ESPARZA CARBAJAL,

**Plaintiff,**

V.

ANDREW SAUL, Commissioner of Social Security,

**Defendant.**

CASE NUMBER: 1:20-cv-01157-GSA

**ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO  
CLARIFY THE NATURE OF THE  
STIPULATED EXTENSION**

On June 28, 2021, Plaintiff filed a stipulation and proposed order for an extension of time from June 28 to July 28 to serve her confidential letter brief. Doc. 16. This was the first extension sought by either party in this matter.

Pursuant to the scheduling order, “the court will allow a single thirty (30) day extension of any part of this scheduling order by stipulation of the parties. Court approval is not required for this extension. However, the stipulation shall be filed with the court.” ECF No. 5 at 3. If that was the basis for Plaintiff’s extension, the stipulation should so specify and should omit the corresponding proposed order, as court approval is not required. If this was not the basis for the extension the stipulation should take the form of a motion (specifying whether the motion is unopposed), and should set forth good cause for the request. *See* ECF No. 5 at 3 (“Request for modification of this briefing schedule will not routinely be granted . . . With the exception of the single thirty-day extension, requests to modify this order must be made by written motion and will be granted only for good cause.”)).

Accordingly, within 7 days of the entry of this order Plaintiff is **DIRECTED** to do one of the following: 1) file an amended stipulation citing the above provision of the scheduling order

1 and omitting the attached proposed order, 2) file a motion substantiating the requested extension,  
2 **or** 3) serve the confidential letter brief and file a proof of service with the court.

3  
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
5

6 Dated: June 29, 2021

7 /s/ Gary S. Austin

8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28